PRG...

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,549	07/03/2001	Erno Kovacs	450117-03450	2858

20999 7590 07/14/2004

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HARESH N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004 8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/898,549	KOVACS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 May 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 July 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. Applicant needs to submit formal drawings for the drawings submitted on 3/4/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Helgeson et al. 6,643,652 (Hereinafter Helgeson).

5. As per claims 1, 6, 8 and 9, Helgeson teaches the following:

Portal application for implementation on a multipurpose computer for providing access from a client to a multimedia service , (e.g., The present invention presents a method for managing data exchange among systems connected via a network. A plurality of predefined stylesheets are generated, with each stylesheet describing a mapping between a system specific

local format and a generic interchange format. A data object is received from a first system in a first system specific local format. This data object is translated from the first system specific local format to a generic interchange format object with the predefined stylesheets using a system specific service which utilizes a native application programming interface of said first system. The data object is then translated from the generic interchange format to a second system specific local format object with the predefined stylesheets using a system specific service which utilizes a native application programming interface of said second system. The translated data object is then transferred to the second system, col.2, lines 51 – 67),

wherein the portal application comprises a plurality of services (e.g., PreferenceManager--Set user preferences, SecurityManager--Manage user privileges. Assign permitted operations on objects to users and groups. ServiceHolderManager--Enable and disable common services (discussion, chat, etc.), col. 7, lines 47 – 61, col. 4 line 39 – col. 12 line 8),

respectively structured according to the model-view-controller architecture (e.g., The architecture of the present invention adopts a three-tier model and is shown in the diagram in FIG. 3. In FIG. 3 a tier 1 web user 301 is connected electronically to a tier 2 web server 305 which is connected to a tier 3 applications server 307. Also in Tier 1 a dedicated user 311 may be directly connected to a tier 3 applications server 307. And the tier 3 applications server 307 may be connected to a database management system 309, col. 11, lines 27 – 38, col. 10, line 24 – col. 31, line 29, Application Development Model, col. 33, line 65 – col. 136, line 67),

and respectively comprising at least one model containing data (e.g., database management system 309, col. 11, lines 27 – 38, col. 10, line 24 – col. 31, line 29), a controller (e.g., Servlet, col., 27, line 20 – col. 38, line 45), and at least one view (e.g., Java Server Page,

col., 27, line 20 – col. 38, line 45), for the presentation of data of the model (e.g., a tier 3 applications server 307. Also in Tier 1 a dedicated user 311 may be directly connected to a tier 3 applications server 307. And the tier 3 applications server 307 may be connected to a database management system 309, col. 11, lines 27 – 38, col. 10, line 24 – col. 31, line 29), wherein the services are designed to communicate with each other by means of the controller a tier 3 applications server 307. Also in Tier 1 a dedicated user 311 may be directly connected to a tier 3 applications server 307. And the tier 3 applications server 307 may be connected to a database management system 309, col. 11, lines 27 – 38, col. 10, line 24 – col. 31, line 29),

a plurality of views (e.g., Java Server Pages, col., 27, line 20 – col. 38, line 45, An application would typically also include UI components (such as JSP pages or servlets) which would use such business components, col. 33, line 65 – col. 136, line 67), for the presentation of data of different mark-up languages (e.g., HTML, XSL/XSLT, WAP/WML, etc. figure 4),

Multimedia service comprises a portal application (e.g., services offered by information server, interface server, business server of the SABA business platform, figure 17),

sending a request to a first core service responsible for user management and/or administrative processing (e.g., communication between the applications, common business objects and the core services, figure 5),

forwarding the request from the first core service to a second special service (e.g., core service forwarding emails, faxes to the particular services handling them, col. 22, line 59 – col. 38, line 46, and

establishing a communication between the client and the second special service (e.g., client connection to the SABA business platform services supported by the interface server,

figure 17, The present mechanism provides a solution to the needs described above through a system and method for managing data exchange among systems in a network. The systems and methods of the present mechanism translate data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined stylesheets using generic components and a system specific service components which utilize a native application programming interface of the specific local system, abstract).

6. As per claims 2-5, 7, 10, Helgeson teaches the following:

a controller (e.g., Servlet) of a service is designed to select one of a plurality of views (e.g., Java Server Pages) of the service according to the mark-up language used, the state of the controller is a function of a client's request, the special services are distributed over a network (e.g., HTML, XSL/XSLT, WAP/WML, etc. figure 4, The present mechanism provides a solution to the needs described above through a system and method for managing data exchange among systems in a network. The systems and methods of the present mechanism translate data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined stylesheets using generic components and a system specific service components which utilize a native application programming interface of the specific local system, abstract).

a controller of a service is designed to control at least one further controller of another or the same service (e.g., Servlet controlling another servlet handling a service , col., 27, line 20 – col. 38, line 45),

a controller of a service is designed to control a plurality of views for different presentations (e.g., Servlet controlling multiple Java Server pages for different user services, col., 27, line 20 – col. 38, line 45),

depending on one of the browser characteristic of the client, - device characteristics, time and/or date location, language, and user preferences (e.g., depending on locales, languages, timezones, and display formats, etc., col., 27, line 20 – col. 38, line 45).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (1) "model-view-controller is a well known software implementation, and comprises a logical structure of a software program. Such a model-view-controller does not comprise a hardware arrangement. The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Helgenson teaches the well-known concept of the use of model-view-controller that uses hardware (e.g., col., 2, line 51 – col., 4, line 35). Therefore examiner believes that the claimed limitations are taught by the prior art.

Applicant argues (2) "Helgenson has noting to do with a logical organization of a multi-media service according to model-view-controller software model". The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Helgenson teaches the well-known concept of the use of a service to handle well-known web content server multimedia data using the model-view-controller (e.g., col., 2, line 51 – col., 4, line 35). Therefore examiner believes that the claimed limitations are taught by the prior art.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record (see form PTO-892 cited arts, applicant submitted IDS cited arts, international search cited arts) and not relied upon is also considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Haresh Patel

July 10, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100